DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 179 CG 011 507

AUTHOR Murray, Carol A.; and Others
TITLE Attitudes Toward the Psychologically Disabled, Physically Disabled, and Nondisabled.
PUB DATE [72]
NOTE 70p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; *Bias; Discriminatory Attitudes (Social); *Emotional Response; Empathy; Mentally Handicapped; *Physically Handicapped; *Psychological Patterns; *Rejection; Research Projects; Sex Discrimination

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes on nondisabled persons toward physically disabled, psychologically disabled and nondisabled persons. The type of impairment, physical, psychological or normal, degree of impairment, mild, severe, sex of stimulus person male, female and the sex of the subjects were the independent variables. The subjects consisted of 200 psychological students from Kent State University, Ashtabula Regional Campus. Each S viewed one of the 10 video tape conditions depicting either a male stimulus person or a female stimulus person displaying a physical disability, a psychological disability or no disability. The results indicated a strong rejection effect toward persons with psychological disabilities and a sympathy effect toward persons with a physical disability. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136179

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PSYCHOLOGICALLY DISABLED, PHYSICALLY DISABLED, AND NONDISABLED

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Carol Ann Murray

Edward J. Murray

and

Paul Monkowski

2

CG011507

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Hypotheses	14
Method	15
Analysis of Results	23
Discussion	45
Appendix	52
References	59

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1 24

Table 2 26

Table 3 27

Table 4 28

Table 5 30

Table 6 31

Table 7 32

Table 8 33

Table 9 35

Table 10. 36

Table 11. 37

Table 12. 38-40

Table 13. 42

Table 14. 43

Introduction

The 1972 political scene was packed with a variety of disastrous incidents and problems. The reactions of the American public to these various episodes were mixed. The public's attitude fluctuated between the polarities of extreme apathy and strong commitment.

The lives and careers of two men actively involved in the 1972 political scene were gravely affected. The two men were George Wallace and Thomas Eagleton.

George Wallace, a candidate for the 1972 Democratic ticket, incurred a physical impairment. The assassination attempt upon Wallace's life in May of 1972 resulted in a serious injury to his back. This injury caused paralysis of both legs and permanent confinement to a wheelchair.

Thomas Eagleton was nominated and became the Democratic candidate for Vice President. Eagleton was forcefully squeezed off the 1972 Democratic ticket in August, 1972. It was disclosed that he had experienced several periods of depression which forced him to be hospitalized. This information labeled him as a person possessing a psychological disability (Time, August 7, 1972). Several influential Democrats and editorial writers in the Washington Post, Baltimore

Sun, Los Angeles Times, and New York Times demanded that Eagleton resign from the Democratic ticket. The pressure increased and Thomas Eagleton resigned three weeks after his acceptance speech.

Time magazine (May 29, 1972) stated that prior to the Wallace assassination attempt, he was not expected to carry the Michigan and Maryland primaries. The May 27, 1972 issue of the New Republic commented that spot checks indicated that only a few people in Maryland and Michigan switched their vote to Wallace out of sympathy. The fact remains that Wallace won both state primary elections the day after the assassination attempt upon his life.

Thomas Eagleton, on the other hand, was endorsed by the national Democratic convention in July, 1972. A Time survey conducted by Crossley Surveys Inc. indicated that 76-77% of those persons polled said Eagleton's past psychological disorder would not influence their vote. The fact is that three weeks after Thomas Eagleton delivered his acceptance speech, he was cut from the Democratic ticket.

The outcomes which result from both men's disabilities appear to imply that people hold a more favorable attitude toward a person who incurs a physical disability than toward a person who experiences a psychological disability.

Based upon the practical experiences of Wallace and Eagleton, the problems of this study are: Do people without physical or psychological disabilities have more favorable

attitudes toward other people without physical or psychological disabilities than they do toward people with physical or psychological disabilities? Do people without physical or psychological disabilities have more favorable attitudes toward the physically disabled than the psychologically disabled? Do people without physical or psychological disabilities have more favorable attitudes toward the less severely disabled than the more severely disabled?

A brief review of previous research can provide some insights into these problems. Barker (1964) factor analyzed the data from Nunnally's (1961) study involving 20 different types of disabilities. His results indicated two distinct attitude factors toward disabled persons. One factor was organic or physical in nature and the other factor was functional or psychological in nature. For example, an alcoholic was perceived more similar to a psychotic, whereas a person with a brain tumor and a person with leprosy were viewed as more similar to a person with blindness.

When attitudes toward disabled persons are compared with attitudes toward nondisabled, an overwhelming amount of research suggests that people perceive the disabled person as being considerably "different" from the nondisabled person (Barker, 1948; Best, 1967; Chesler, 1965; Cruickshank, 1948; DuBrow, 1965; Granofsky, 1956; Handle, 1960; Kutner, 1971; MacDonald & Hall, 1969; Neff & Weiss, 1965; Sussman, 1966, 1969).

Wright (1960) states that disabled people are "given a social status comparable to that of an underprivileged minority group." Results from a study by Siller, et al., (1969) suggest that attitudes toward the physically disabled are less favorable than attitudes toward the so-called normal or nondisabled person.

An article by Meyerson (1948) pinpointed the major problem of the physically disabled person. Social and psychological problems are more major than physical problems. Meyerson pointed out that deviations from the social norms of physical attractiveness result in negative attitudes toward the physically disabled person. Movies and TV programs often have characterized the villains or the bad guys with some type of physical disability. Advertisements stress the physical attractiveness of their stimulus person. Therefore, it can be argued that society learns to reinforce physical attractiveness and punish and stigmatize physical disability. "A sound mind in a sound body" implies "a crooked mind in a crooked body" (Meyerson, 1948, p. 3).

Feinberg (1967) found that social desirability influenced the attitudes of undergraduates from a New York State University toward the disabled. Most authors, such as Goffman (1963), Nunnally (1960), and Wright (1960), have pointed out that a physical disability creates an atmosphere of prejudice toward the physically disabled person. Other findings have also indicated the presence of negative

attitudes in regard to the physically disabled person (Chesler, 1965; Yuker, 1965).

The literature concerning the physically disabled person strongly indicates that people are less favorable to a person with a physical disability than a person without a physical disability.

An examination of the literature regarding psychological disabilities shows similar trends. Johannsen (1969) in an article concerning attitudes toward the mental patient stated, "The mental patient bears a stigma .... Yet, the nature of this stigma is peculiar, since there are no distinguishing physical traits that set the mental patient apart from the bulk of humanity" (p. 218). In Johannsen's review of the literature focusing on attitudes toward persons with psychological disabilities, he commented that, for the most part, they are regarded as fearful, weak, worthless, dirty, dangerous, distrustful, and unpredictable. In other words, when a person with a psychological disability was compared with a normal person, the psychologically disabled person received negative feedback. However, Johannsen stated, "The neurotic is not stigmatized to the same degree as the psychotic person (p. 220).

Some specific professional groups are depicted with negative attitudes similar to the general public. For example, Nunnally (1961) found that general medical practitioners treat a sizable proportion of people with

psychological disabilities. However, Nunnally also discovered that "general practitioners tend to have as negative attitudes toward the mentally ill as do members of the lay public" (104). General practitioners regard the neurotic person and particularly the psychotic person as twisted, dirty, complicated, dangerous, and unpredictable (Nunnally, 1961, pp. 104-105).

Employers and family members of persons with a psychological disability also exhibited negative attitudes toward the person with a psychological disability. Olshansky, Grob & Malamud (1958) found a large number of employers in the Boston area associating mental illness with character weakness and viewing such psychologically disabled persons as poor risks.

Sarbin and Mancuso (1970) agreed with other research findings. They concluded, "The public tends to declare negative (rejecting) valuation on persons diagnosed as mentally ill" (p. 159). They further point out that the public is more tolerant of deviant conduct or behavior when it is not matched with a psychological label. Sarbin and Mancuso draw the following conclusions:

> First, the public is not sympathetic toward persons who are labeled mentally ill. They look upon such persons with disrespect and are willing to relegate them to a childlike, nonperson role. An exemplar of the general public would place a sizable social distance between himself and those persons who are labeled mentally ill.

> A second general conclusion is that the public does not share the professionals' propensity for labeling deviant behavior as mental illness. The survey data have shown repeatedly that only persons who exhibit the most exaggerated deviations will be regarded as mentally ill (pp. 168-169).

The literature not only shows that the general public has negative attitudes toward the psychologically disabled but certain specific groups also exhibit equally negative attitudes.

Yuker (1965) pointed out that attitudes, whether positive or negative, toward the disabled can result in the prediction of behavior. Negative attitudes toward the disabled person may lead to avoidance of the disabled person by the nondisabled. Rejection and negative attitudes will also minimize interaction between them. Thus the chances of an association or friendship between a disabled and a nondisabled person is not likely to develop. Yuker also states that when positive attitudes are evoked from the nondisabled toward the disabled, feelings of warmth, acceptance, and friendship may develop. His argumentation suggests that the lack of attraction toward the disabled person places this study within the framework of attraction research.

The problem of attraction is what makes people like each other, or what makes people dislike one another. Aronson (1973) postulates several antecedents of interpersonal attraction:

1) Proximity or propinquity--all other things being equal, people who are closer to us are liked better than are people who are at a distance (Festinger, Schachter, & Black, 1950).

It would appear from the research findings concerning disabled persons, all other things are not equal. According to the literature, the recognition of a disability, whether psychological or physical, evokes negative and rejecting attitudes. These attitudes contribute to avoidance or the maintaining of distance between the nondisabled and the disabled (Goffman, 1963; Kleck, 1968; Yuker, 1965).

2) Similarity of values and beliefs--people who agree with us are liked better than people who disagree with us (Byrne, 1969).

3) Similarity of personality traits--we like people who are like us (Shapiro, 1953).

However, as stated earlier, the research findings involving the disabled demonstrate that the disabled are perceived to be considerably "different" from nondisabled (Neff & Weiss, 1965). Therefore, for the purpose of this study this factor will be switched to state we dislike people who are dissimilar.

4) Complementarity of need systems--under certain conditions we like people whose characteristics make it easy for them to satisfy our needs and whose needs are such that we can easily satisfy

them (Winch, 1958).

Again the literature regarding the disabled person indicates that they are perceived as being a burden. They are unable to satisfy the needs of the nondisabled person, and are therefore rejected and avoided. However, there is the notion of dependency which is attached to the disabled (Kutner, 1970). Dependency might be looked upon by some people as a way of satisfying some needs, but in most cases it will be viewed as an indication of weakness.

5) High ability--we like able and competent people better than incompetent people (Iverson, 1964).

Often the disabled are viewed by others and themselves as performing poorly on tasks (Kutner, 1970). The disabled are also considered worthless (Johannsen, 1969). According to Aronson (1973), "All these antecedents can be loosely summarized under a general reward-cost or exchange theory" (p. 32). George Homan (1961) has developed an exchange or cost-reward theory to explain many aspects of social behavior. His theory basically follows the Skinnerian approach of reinforcement (Deutsch & Krauss, 1965, p. 112).

There are four basic concepts affiliated with Homan's Exchange Theory. They are reward, cost, outcome, and comparison level. Secord and Backman (1964) define these concepts in relationship to Homan's Theory. The concept of reward is defined as "any activity on the part of one person that contributes to the gratification of another person's

needs can be considered a reward from the standpoint of the latter person" (p. 253). They define cost as nonreward.

> The cost of engaging in any activity not only includes the 'punishment' incurred in carrying out that activity such as fatigue or anxiety ... but also includes the value of rewards foregone by engaging in this activity rather than alternative activities (p. 253).

The term outcome is described as either positive--profit, or negative--loss. Outcome is defined as "reward less cost." "If the outcome of an interaction is positive, it may be said to yield a profit; if it is negative, a loss" (p. 253). Comparison level is explained as some minimum level of expectation.

> For attraction to occur, the outcome must be above some minimum level of expectation or dessert ... This level is influenced by past experiences in this relation, past experiences in comparable relations, his judgment of what outcomes others like himself are receiving, and his perceptions of outcomes available to him in alternative relations (p. 253).

The formula used with Homan's Exchange Theory states R (reward) - C (cost) = Outcome (profit or loss). If the reward incurred is greater than the cost involved, the outcome will be a profit or a degree of positive outcome. However, if the cost experienced is greater than the reward received, the outcome will result in a loss outcome or a degree of negative outcome.

The literature reviewed in this study can be synthesized into Homan's Exchange Theory. For example, the

research regarding disabled persons, whether physically or psychologically disabled, indicates that the disabled are perceived to be "different" and evoke negative attitudes. This research implies that nondisabled persons interacting with a disabled person will incur a degree of cost. Therefore, according to Homan's Exchange Theory, it can be said that it is more costly to interact with a disabled person than it is to interact with a person who is not disabled.

It can be further postulated that nondisabled persons receive a profit outcome when they interact with nondisabled persons. However, when nondisabled persons interact with disabled persons, they receive a lower degree of reward and could even experience a degree of cost.

It is this writer's view that people experience less cost when interacting with a physically disabled person than when interacting with a psychologically disabled person. The reason for this insight is that physical disabilities are looked upon to be the result of an external factor--other inflicted. Therefore, individuals with physical disabilities have no control over their impairments. In contrast, psychological disabilities are often considered to be caused by a lack of internal control and are self-inflicted. Individuals with psychological disabilities are often held personally responsible for their pathological behavior.

This present study is a manipulative study. The controls in this study provide the E with the ability to examine the effects of various controlled stimuli upon S's. Most studies performed in this area have lacked controls over what the S's will experience. This study has an added importance in that it is not drawing upon the S's previous experiences with disabled persons, either physically or psychologically. Furthermore, this study avoids the pitfall of dealing with some vague stereo-typical disability like mentally ill, insane, insane man, and insane woman. The value of this study is its control of the independent variables through the use of videotape. This control enables the E to determine the influence of a particular stimuli upon the S's.

The literature review and its theoretical implications provide the framework in which to describe the purpose of this study. The primary purpose of this study is to examine the attitudes of nondisabled persons toward disabled people. This study will also investigate whether the degree of impairment, mild or severe, has an effect upon the attitudes of nondisabled persons toward the physically and psychologically disabled person.

A further purpose of this study is to take into consideration the sex of the physically and psychologically disabled person. The sex of the subjects will be another factor for consideration.

The term disability has been defined by Kutner (1971) as

> an enduring measurable or testable impairment of function emanating from psychological disorder, physical illness, injury, or congenital malformation and producing long-term (though not necessarily irremediable) changes in the performance of normally expected social roles and behavior (p. 144).

Therefore, the operational definitions center around the types of disability, normal, physical, and psychological, plus the two degrees of impairment, mild and severe. The physically disabled mild condition will be operationalized by a person having a partially paralyzed right hand and arm. In the physically severe condition, a person having cerebral palsy will serve as the operational definition. The psychologically mild condition will be operationalized by a person exhibiting behaviors which demonstrate anxiety reaction. The operational definition of the psychologically severe condition will be a person expressing paranoid behaviors. In the normal condition no perceivable physical or psychological disability will be demonstrated. The same operational definitions will be used for either sex.

This now leads to the hypotheses of this study. The first hypothesis states that normals or nondisabled persons will have more favorable attitudes toward nondisabled persons than toward persons exhibiting a disability.

The second hypothesis is concerned with the degree of impairment, mild or severe. It is hypothesized that a disabled person (physical or psychological) demonstrating a mild degree of impairment will receive more favorable attitudes than will a person exhibiting a severe physical or psychological disability.

The third hypothesis focuses upon the type of disability, physical and psychological. It is hypothesized that the physically disabled person will receive more favorable attitudes from nondisabled persons than will the psychologically disabled person.

It is further hypothesized that a female with a physical disability will receive more favorable attitudes than a female displaying a psychological disability.

The fifth hypothesis states that a male exhibiting a physical disability will be viewed more favorably than a male displaying a psychological disability.

The last hypothesis is that a male who exhibits either a mild or severe psychological disability will be perceived to be the least favorable person.

Method

Subject

The subjects were 200 psychology students attending Kent State University, Ashtabula Regional Campus. Approximately 100 students from the introductory psychology course were used and another 100 students from the Child Development Course, Spring, 1974. The total number of S's was divided evenly between male and female. All S's were randomly assigned to one of the 10 conditions.

Design

A 5x2x2 factorial design was used. The independent variables consisted of type of disability, sex of stimulus person, and sex of subject. Two types of disabilities, physical and psychological, each had two degrees of impairment, mild and severe. The normal condition displayed a stimulus person without any perceivable physical or psychological disability. The normal condition did not display any degree of impairment.

The dependent variables included three attitude scales. The Attitude Toward Disabled Persons Scale (ATDP Scale) was developed by Yuker and his associates (1960, 1966). This scale consists of 30 items. Each item is rated

from 3 to -3. The summation of each item score yields an overall attitude score. The ATDP Scale is one of the most widely known and used attitude scales for measuring attitudes toward disabled persons. The next attitude scale which was used was the Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1933). This scale has seven kinds of social contacts which vary in degree of sympathetic understanding and personal-group distance. Bogardus' scale uses the Likert method of measuring attitudes. The last scale to be included is the Attitude Toward Employment Scale (Kirchner, 1952, 1957). This scale consists of 24 items, however for the purpose of this study only 10 items were included. On this scale the name of the male stimulus person--interviewee Mr. Haely--was used and the name of the female stimulus person--interviewee Miss Haely--was used. Each item was measured by a 7-point, Likert-type response. All three attitude scales used a 7-point, Likert-type method.

The dependent variables were analyzed by analysis of variance procedures. Each item on each scale was analyzed separately for significant main effects and interaction effects. Each scale was factor analyzed for factor loadings. Each factor was then analyzed separately for significant main effects and interaction effects.

Experimental Conditions

Each S viewed one of 10 different videotape segments.

The segments viewed by each S were randomly assigned. Four of the videotape segments focused upon a psychological disability. Two of the psychological conditions involved the use of videotapes with a female stimulus person. One tape exhibited the female stimulus person displaying a mild psychological disability--anxiety reaction. This condition was labeled female mild psychological condition. The other tape displayed the female stimulus person possessing a severe psychological disability--paranoid behavior. This condition was called female severe psychological condition. The remaining two psychological conditions had the male stimulus person demonstrating the same mild psychological disability, while the other tape depicted the male stimulus person expressing the same severe psychological disability. These conditions are referred to as male mild psychological condition and male severe psychological condition respectfully.

Four other videotapes dealt with the conditions involving physical disability and their degrees of impairment, mild or severe, and sex of stimulus person, female or male. One condition showed a tape of the male stimulus person with a mild physical disability--paralyzed right arm. This condition was called male mild physical condition. Another condition depicted the male stimulus person displaying a severe physical disability--cerebral palsy. This was called the male severe physical condition. The two remaining

physical conditions depicted a female stimulus person. One tape demonstrated the female stimulus person exhibiting the same mild physical impairment. The other tape portrayed the female stimulus person possessing the same severe physical impairment. These two conditions were referred to as female mild physical condition and female severe physical condition.

The normal condition also served as the control. One videotape depicted the female stimulus person with no visible or apparent physical or psychological impairments. The other tape presented the male stimulus person exhibiting no perceivable physical or psychological disabilities.

The 10 different conditions are listed below:

1. Female mild psychological condition (anxiety reaction)
2. Female severe psychological condition (paranoid behavior)
3. Male mild psychological condition (anxiety reaction)
4. Male severe psychological condition (paranoid behavior)
5. Female mild physical condition (partially paralyzed right arm)
6. Female severe physical condition (cerebral palsy)
7. Male mild physical condition (partially paralyzed right arm)
8. Male severe physical condition (cerebral palsy)
9. Female normal/control condition (no perceivable disability)
10. Male normal/control condition (no perceivable disability)

A panel made up of three professional judges evaluated the

degree of impairment of the manipulations on a 7-point, Likert-type scale.

These judges rated the control group as nondisabled, the mild physical and mild psychological conditions as moderately disabled, and the severe physical and psychological conditions as severely disabled for both female and male stimulus persons.

Thirteen students from a psychology research class were also used as judges. These student judges rated the conditions similar to the professional judges. Student judges' ratings indicated significant difference between the physically mild condition and the psychologically mild condition. The psychologically mild condition was rated significantly more disabling than the physically mild condition. The student judges also indicated significant difference between the physically severe condition and the psychologically severe condition. The physically severe condition was rated as significantly more disabling than the psychologically severe condition.

Stimulus Person

For purposes of control, only two stimulus persons were used. One stimulus person was female, the other male. The same female actress appeared on all the tapes involving the female stimulus person. The same male actor was used in all the conditions involving the male stimulus person.

Both the female actress-female stimulus person and the male actor-male stimulus person have had experience in acting.

Script

The physical setting was identical in all 10 conditions. The physical setting included a desk with a telephone, a desk lamp, and a pen and penholder. A chair was placed directly behind the desk for the employment interviewer. Another chair was placed in front of the desk for the interviewee. The employment interviewer was played by a male actor. The videotape camera was stationed directly behind the chair of the employment interviewer. This arrangement allowed the camera to focus directly upon the stimulus person throughout each segment.

The camera shots, close-ups or distance shots, were controlled and regulated for all 10 conditions. In other words the camera shots were constant for all 10 conditions. The cameraman is a major in telecommunications and has worked in a videotape studio for five years.

Procedure

Each S was randomly assigned to one of the 10 conditions. All subjects were presented the same cover story. The cover story was taped to control all conditions. The voice for the recorded instructions was the E's voice. An undergraduate, majoring in telecommunications, served as

the E. The E turned on the tape recorder and the following cover story and instructions were played for all subjects.

Cover Story

> In two minutes you will be shown a videotaped session between an interviewer and an interviewee. Our purpose is to have you view this videotape which hopefully will aid us in our survey for job readiness programs.
>
> Job readiness programs are designed to help the interviewees improve their interviewing skills for employment.
>
> People who work in employment offices, or personnel managers, experience more than 150 interviews per month, therefore their skills in interviewing are always improving. Our concern, however, is not with the interviewer, it is with the interviewees.
>
> There are numerous job readiness programs in existence. Each program has its own theory, method, tools, and techniques. We want to assess the various job readiness programs.
>
> We would like you to view this tape. After the tape is completed, the E will pass out a questionnaire. We would like you to answer all the questions. Please DO NOT place your name on the questionnaire. Please indicate your sex. Please mark male or female at the appropriate place.
>
> While you are waiting for the E to begin the videotape, please clear your desk of all books, materials, and pens. Thank you.

After the cover story was heard by the S's the videotape was presented. S's viewed one of the 10 taped conditions which ran approximately between 7-10 minutes. The E then turned off the videotape recorder and administered the Social Distance and Employment questionnaires. After S's responded to these questionnaires, the Yuker's Attitudes

Toward Disabled Persons questionnaire was passed out separately. The reason for this was to control the demand characteristics which could be triggered by the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale.

Analysis of Results

The discussion of results will be broken down to include three distinct sections. Each section will report separately the findings for each dependent variable, Social Distance, Attitudes Toward Employment and Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons. All three sections will include a factor analysis. The factors will be analyzed by an analysis of variance followed by the Newman Keuls post hoc comparison of mean differences.

A correlation between the three dependent variables, Social Distance Scale, Employment Scale, and Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale, indicates that the Social Distance Scale and the Attitudes Toward Employment Scale show a high relationship, r = .82, whereas both of these scales demonstrate a low inverse relationship, when they are correlated with Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale. The results of these findings are reported in Table 1.

Social Distance Scale

The factor analysis performed on the Social Distance Scale shows that this scale consists of one factor. The reliability for this factor is .99 and accounts for 62 percent of the total explainable variance. The individual

TABLE 1

Correlation Between
Social Distance, Attitudes
Toward Employment and Attitudes
Toward Disabled Persons

	Attitudes Toward Employment	Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons
Social Distance Scale	.82	-.24
Employment Scale	-	-.17

item loadings for the Social Distance Scale are all above the .30 minimum and are reported in Table 2.

The analysis of variance performed on the Social Distance Factor indicates that S's reacted differently to the various independent manipulations. The analysis of variance demonstrates a strong main effect with regard to disability impairment, $F = 67.98$, $df = 4/180$, $p < 0.0000$. The analysis of variance for the Social Distance Factor is reported in Table 3.

The means for all five disability impairments are reported in Table 4. A low mean value indicates a favorable attitude on the Social Distance Factor, whereas a high mean value suggests unfavorable attitudes. A post hoc Newman Kouls comparison of the five means shows that psychologically disabled receive significantly less favorable attitudes than do normals. The severe psychologically disabled receive significantly more unfavorable ratings than the mild psychologically disabled. Conversely, both the mild and severe physically disabled persons are viewed as significantly more favorable than are the normals. However, there is no significant difference between mild physically and severe physically disabled persons.

These findings seem to demonstrate rejection toward persons incurring a psychological disability. However, persons possessing a severe psychological disability receive a greater degree of rejection than do persons with a mild

TABLE 2

Item Loadings On the
Social Distance Factor

Item	Factor Loadings
Intimate friend	.77
Close kin by marriage	.78
Depending on sex roommate/date	.69
Personal friend in my club	.86
My neighbor	.89
Husband's or wife's friend	.84
Live in same apartment	.72
Speaking acquaintance	.75
Rent property	.75
Exclude from neighbordhood	.70
Exclude from University	.69

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance
of the
Social Distance Factor

Source	df	F	p
Disability Impairment	4	67.98	0.0000
Sex of Stimulus Person	1	1.12	0.29
Disability X Sex of Stimulus Person	4	1.59	0.17
Sex of Subject	1	.17	0.69
Disability X Sex of Subject	4	.44	0.78
Sex of Stimulus Person X Sex of Subject	1	1.44	0.23
Disability X Sex of Stimulus Person X Sex of Subject	4	2.23	0.07
Error	180		

TABLE 4

Means on the Social Distance
Factor for each degree of Disability

Severe Psychological	Mild Psychological	Normal	Mild Physical	Severe Physical
50.33	34.73	29.18	24.23	21.48

psychological impairment. These results also appear to indicate the presence of a sympathy effect for all physically disabled persons.

The Newman Keuls comparison between means is reported in Table 5.

Attitudes Toward Employment Scale

The factor analysis performed on the Attitudes Toward Employment Scale shows that this scale is composed of one factor. The reliability for this factor is .99 and accounts for 58 percent of the total explainable variance. The individual item loadings on the Employment Scale are all above the .30 minimum and are reported in Table 6.

The results from the analysis of variance on the Employment Factor show that the manipulation of the independent variable, disability impairment, affected the attitudes of the subjects toward the employment of people possessing disabilities. The analysis of variance demonstrates a strong main effect of disability impairment, $F = 61.34$, $df = 4/180$, $p < 0.0000$. The analysis of variance concerning the Employment Scale is reported in Table 7.

The means for all disability impairments are reported in Table 8. A low mean indicates a favorable attitude toward a disabled person and a higher mean suggests a more unfavorable attitude toward a person with a disability. These findings indicate a rejection of a person with a

TABLE 5

Newman Keuls Comparison
of Means
for
the Social Distance
Factor

Disability Impairment		df	q	p
Severe Phy.	vs Severe Psy.	5/180	20.6	.01
Severe Phy.	vs Mild Psy.	4/180	9.5	.01
Severe Phy.	vs Normal	3/180	5.5	.01
Severe Phy.	vs Mild Phy.	2/180	1.9	n.s.
Mild Phy.	vs Severe Psy.	4/180	18.6	.01
Mild Phy.	vs Mild Psy.	3/180	7.5	.01
Mild Phy.	vs Normal	2/180	3.5	.025
Normal	vs Severe Psy.	3/180	15.1	.01
Normal	vs Mild Psy.	2/180	4.0	.025
Mild Psy.	vs Severe Psy.	2/180	11.1	.01

TABLE 6

Item Loadings On the Attitude Toward Employment Factor

Item	Factor Loadings
Pick for the job	.81
Work of higher quality	.77
Grouchy on the job	.70
Cooperate more on the job	.81
Happier on the job	.81
More dependable	.77
Not have speed needed	.46
Higher wages	.30
Would hire	.92
Too set in own way to change	.67
Made a good employee	.91

TABLE 7

Analysis of Variance
of the
Employment Factor

Source	df	F	p
Disability Impairment	4	61.34	0.0000
Sex of Stimulus Person	1	3.12	0.08
Disability X Sex of Stimulus Person	4	1.80	0.13
Sex of Subject	1	0.47	0.50
Disability X Sex of Subject	4	1.95	0.10
Sex of Stimulus Person X Sex of Subject	1	0.70	0.59
Disability X Sex of Stimulus Person X Sex of Subject	4	0.33	0.86
Error	180		

TABLE 8

Means for the
Employment Factor

Severe Psychological	Mild Psychological	Normal	Mild Physical	Severe Physical
60.88	45.30	36.63	33.75	32.85

psychological disability and suggest a tendency for a sympathy effect toward a person with a physical disability.

A post hoc Newman Keuls analysis of the means indicates that most means are significantly different from each other. However, the means for the normal, mild physical, and severe physical are not significantly different from each other. The Newman Keuls comparison between means is reported in Table 9.

Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale

A factor analysis performed on the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale points out six factors which account for 56 percent of the total explainable variance. Factor one has high reliability. The other five factors have only moderate reliability. The reliability scores for these six factors are reported in Table 10.

The percentage of explainable variance for each of these six factors is found in Table 11.

The item loadings on the six factors from the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale are reported in Table 12. However, for the first factor only twenty out of the thirty items are above the .30 minimum. This factor appears to be dealing with the perception of personality characteristics with regard to disabled persons.

An analysis of variance performed on the six factors from the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale shows that

TABLE 9

Newman Keuls Com arison
of Mean Differences for
Attitudes Toward Employment Factor

Disability Impairment	df	q	p
Severe Phy. vs Severe Psy.	5/180	18.1	.01
Severe Phy. vs Mild Psy.	4/180	8.3	.01
Severe Phy. vs Normal	3/180	2.5	n.s.
Severe Phy. vs Mild Phy.	2/180	0.6	n.s.
Mild Phy. vs Severe Psy.	4/180	18.0	.01
Mild Phy. vs Mild Psy.	3/180	7.7	.01
Mild Phy. vs Normal	2/180	1.9	n.s.
Normal vs Severe Psy.	3/180	16.1	.01
Normal vs Mild Psy.	2/180	5.8	.01
Mild Psy. vs Severe Psy.	2/180	10.5	.01

TABLE 10

Reliability Scores
For the Six Factors
On Attitudes Toward Disabled
Persons Scale

Factors	Reliability Scores
1	.93
2	.75
3	.68
4	.61
5	.58
6	.51

TABLE 11

Percentage of Explainable Variance for Six Factors on the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons

Factor	Percentage of Explainable Variance
1	11
2	12
3	7
4	9
5	11
6	6

TABLE 12

Item Loadings on Six Factors
From the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale

Item	1st Factor	2nd Factor	3rd Factor	4th Factor	5th Factor	6th Factor
* Unfriendly	-.42	.05	.04	.07	.33	-.23
Should not compete for jobs with normals	-.25	-.29	-.25	-.17	.25	.15
* More emotional	-.57	-.01	.15	.11	.19	-.04
More self-conscious	-.35	-.38	.32	.16	.06	-.19
Should expect as much	-.06	-.27	-.22	-.31	-.11	.19
* Cannot be as successful	-.34	.24	-.20	-.03	.31	.08
* No contribution	-.40	.36	-.06	-.09	.14	.07
* Nondisabled not want to marry disabled	-.11	.12	.25	-.33	.06	.23
* Show as much enthusiasm	-.42	.31	.07	-.04	-.22	.12
More sensitive	-.26	-.40	.25	.18	.29	-.02
* Untidy	-.39	.12	.03	.11	.28	.03
As good as others	-.19	-.10	.13	.06	-.08	.23

TABLE 12

Continued

Item	1st Factor	2nd Factor	3rd Factor	4th Factor	5th Factor	6th Factor
Driving test more severe	-.23	-.3	.01	.26	.16	.25
* Sociable	-.42	.17	-.05	.04	-.04	-.22
Not as conscientious	-.29	.27	-.21	.11	.04	-.00
Probably Worry More	-.19	.07	.21	.00	.07	.09
Not Dissatisfied with self	-.27	-.28	-.03	-.13	-.06	-.00
* More misfits	-.47	.06	.14	.00	-.05	.00
* Not get discouraged easily	-.43	-.26	-.02	.06	-.27	-.04
Disabled children should compete with normal	-.10	-.50	-.29	.09	.02	-.00
* Resent normals	-.41	-.10	.15	-.00	-.13	-.29
* Take care of self	-.32	-.8	-.35	.05	-.05	-.12
* Live & work with non-disabled	-.32	-.00	-.41	.28	-.08	.10

TABLE 12

Continued

Item	1st Factor	2nd Factor	3rd Factor	4th Factor	5th Factor	6th Factor
* As ambitious	-.38	-.24	-.08	.14	-.28	.03
* As self-confident	-.43	-.16	.36	.13	-.31	.06
* Want more affection and praise	-.41	-.11	.27	-.10	-.04	.20
* Less intelligent	-.46	.05	-.11	-.23	.13	-.10
* Not want more sympathy	-.37	.04	-.06	.14	-.19	.21
* Are different	-.35	.04	-.04	-.49	-.02	.10
* Irritating	-.44	.12	-.04	-.30	-.19	-.32

Note - * indicates those items on Factor I only which reached the .30 minimum level.

the perception of personality characteristics factor, is the only factor indicating significant results. The analysis of variance on this factor indicates a main effect of disability impairment, $F = 2.569$, $df = 4/180$, $p < 0.04$. These results are reported in Table 13.

The means for the five disability impairments are given in z scores and are reported in Table 14. A negative z score indicates favorableness toward a disabled person and a positive z score represents a less favorable attitude toward a disabled person. Subjects, who viewed the physical conditions, mild and severe, were more favorable toward a disabled person. However, those subjects who viewed both the mild and severe psychological conditions and the normal condition displayed less favorable attitudes toward a person with a disability. This data seems to indicate that subjects who viewed a person with a physical disability are more favorable and accepting of a disabled person. This fact also suggests the possibility of a sympathy effect for persons with a physical disability.

The post hoc Newman Keuls comparison shows no significant differences between means.

In conclusion, the results of this data echo a strong main effect, namely, disability impairment. The findings from this research also suggest a sympathy effect for a person incurring a physical impairment. The findings from the Social Distance Factor show a rejection of a person

TABLE 13

Analysis of Variance
of
Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons
Perception of Personality Characteristics Factor

Source	df	F	p
Disability Impairment	4	2.569	0.04
Sex of Stimulus Person	1	0.782	0.62
Disability X Sex of Stimulus Person	4	1.420	0.23
Sex of Subject	1	0.160	0.70
Disability X Sex of Subject	4	0.628	0.65
Sex of Stimulus Person X Sex of Subject	1	1.333	0.25
Disability X Sex of Stimulus Person X Sex of Subject	4	0.371	0.83
Error	180		

TABLE 14

Means for Perception Personality Characteristics Factor on the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale

Normal	Mild Psychological	Severe Psychological	Mild Physical	Severe Physical
0.262	0.235	0.232	-0.272	-0.458

possessing a psychological disability. However, these findings indicate strong acceptance for a person incurring a physical disability. The data from the Attitudes Toward Employment Factor also indicate rejection of a person with a psychological disability. These data show a tendency for subjects to be more favorable to a person with a physical disability. The findings from the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale, Perception of Personality Characteristics Factor, indicates that exposure to a person with a physical impairment produces a sympathy effect for a person incurring a physical disability. These results support the position that a person with a psychological disability is rejected and a person with a physical disability receives sympathy.

Discussion

This section will be discussed in relationship to the results from the three dependent variables.

Hypothesis I

Normals or nondisabled persons will have more favorable attitudes toward nondisabled persons than toward persons exhibiting a disability.

Hypothesis I is confirmed only in relationship to a psychologically disabled person. This present research finds that a psychologically disabled person is significantly less accepted than a normal person. These findings support the research of MacDonald and Hall (1969); Johannsen (1969); Jensema and Shears (1972); and Sarbin and Mancuso (1970). The results from the present study strongly demonstrate a rejection effect for a person with a psychological disability. Both the Social Distance Factor and the Attitudes Toward Employment Factor show a rejection effect toward a psychologically disabled person.

An unexpected finding in this study is a sympathy effect expressed toward a physically disabled person. The results from the Social Distance Factor show significantly more favorable attitudes toward a physically disabled person

than toward a normal. The Attitudes Toward Employment Factor indicates a tendency toward a sympathy effect. The post hoc comparison of means does not actually show a significant difference between attitudes toward a normal person and attitudes toward a physically disabled person but the numerical differences in means indicate this sympathy effect. The factor, perception of personality characteristics, which was factored out of the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale, also shows support for the sympathy effect. Positive attitudes toward a disabled person are enhanced by exposure to a physically disabled person. The sympathy effect is unexpected, since previous research strongly supports the position that a person with a physical disability receives negative attitudes. The present findings forced this author to reexamine the previous research. The research of Ganskow and Maglione (1965) and Kleck (1968) did support the concept of a sympathy effect; however, these authors never recognized that their results showed this effect.

Hypothesis II

A disabled person (physical or psychological) demonstrating a mild degree of impairment will receive more favorable attitudes than will a person exhibiting a severe physical or psychological disability.

The results show that a person with a mild psychological disability receives more favorable attitudes than a

person with a severe psychological disability. These findings are confirmed by both the Social Distance Factor and the Attitudes Toward Employment Factor. The results support the research cited by Johannsen (1969) and Nunnally (1961).

The results from the Social Distance Factor, Attitudes Toward Employment Factor and Perception of Personality Characteristics Factor from Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale, do not show any significant difference between attitudes toward a mild or severe physically disabled person. These findings contradict the results of Wilson, Sakata and Frumkin (1968); Muklenkamp (1971); and Goodman, Dornbusch, Richardson & Hastoff (1963). These studies in attempting to find favorable and unfavorable attitudes toward types of disabilities used a rank order procedure. The rank order procedure forces subjects to express attitude differences; however, a Likert procedure allows subjects the freedom to express similar attitudes toward various types of physical disabilities. These differences in procedure can account for the contradictory results.

Hypothesis III

A physically disabled person will receive more favorable attitudes from nondisabled persons than will the psychologically disabled person.

The research data strongly support this hypothesis.

The findings from this study confirm the fact that a physically disabled person receives more favorable attitudes from nondisabled persons than does a person possessing a psychological disability. These results are confirmed by all three of the dependent measures, Social Distance Factor, Attitudes Toward Employment Factor, and the Perception of Personality Characteristics Factor from the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale. The sympathy effect expressed toward a physically disabled person and the rejection effect expressed toward the psychologically disabled person accounts for these results.

Hypothesis IV

A female with a physical disability will receive more favorable attitudes than a female displaying a psychological disability.

This fourth hypothesis is also confirmed and supported by the research findings. A female physically disabled person receives more favorable attitudes than does a female who possesses a psychological disability.

Hypothesis V

A male exhibiting a physical disability will be viewed more favorably than a male displaying a psychological disability.

This hypothesis is also supported. A male possessing a physical disability receives more favorable attitudes than

does a male with a psychological disability.

Hypothesis VI

A male who exhibits either a mild or severe psychological disability will be perceived to be the least favorable person.

Hypothesis six is not supported by this present study. The results are contradictory to Philips' (1963, 1964) findings. Philips found that psychologically disabled males received more rejection than females who possessed a psychological disability. In this research sex was not found to be a significant factor. Independent of sex, a person with a psychological disability is perceived to be the least favorable person.

These findings do not completely support Homan's exchange theory. Exchange theory is too simplistic to explain the complex results from this research.

The research shows a rejection effect for the psychologically disabled person. The fact of a rejection effect supports the principles of exchange theory. However, the findings concerning a sympathy effect cannot be explained by exchange theory. A surface analysis of the interaction with a physically disabled person suggests that the interaction has many costly aspects for the nondisabled person. If this analysis is in fact accurate, then the finding of a sympathy effect cannot be explained by exchange theory.

It is the opinion of this researcher that an internal-external locus of control theory would better explain the results. Nondisabled persons perceive a psychological disability as the result of a lack of internal control, or self-inflicted. This means that a person with a psychological disability is personally held responsible for his disability. On the other hand, a physical disability is considered the result of an external factor, or other inflicted. The physically disabled person is not held responsible for his disability. The logical conclusion to this syllogism is a rejection of the person with a psychological disability and sympathy for a person with a physical disability.

There are two limitations in this research. The design of the study was a 5x2x2 factorial but a more balanced design would have had another control group. Therefore, the design of the study would be a 3x2x2x2 factorial. Another limitation in this study is the manipulation of the independent variables. The judges considered the mild physical and psychological manipulations to be significantly different from each other and the severe physical and psychological manipulations to be significantly different from each other. In this present study, the unequal manipulations did not confound the results but with different results it would be impossible to determine if the findings were the results of the subject's attitudes or the unequal manipulations.

One implication from this research is related to the

socio-political community. It is likely that these findings indicate that a physically disabled George Wallace has an advantage in the '76 campaign, due to a sympathy effect. The results also suggest that the voting public would be more favorable toward having their tax dollars spent for physically disabled persons than for the psychologically disabled. These findings also imply that people being released from psychiatric hospitals will not find acceptance in their community. This follows from the rejection effect accompanying psychological disabilities.

This last implication explains some of the problems being incurred by comprehensive mental health programs and centers. These programs are attempting to return people to their local community after state psychiatric hospitalization. Moreover, negative and rejecting attitudes directed toward the psychologically disabled do not make their job any easier.

The final implication of this research is application for a research grant to study attitudes within a community toward the physically and psychologically disabled.

Appendix

Script

The setting will include: office of interviewer, one desk, two chairs (one chair behind the desk, the other chair in front of desk), a telephone on the desk, a desk lamp, and a pen and penholder.

Knock on door.

Interviewer (I)	Stimulus person (S)
	I: Come in, please.

S person enters view of camera, walking toward Interviewer who is situated behind her desk. S person has application form in hand, and walks to desk.

	I: Miss Haely/Mr. Haely.
	S: Yes.
Shaking hands.	I: How do you do? I'm Miss Williams, the personnel manager.
	S: How do you do? Pleased to meet you.
	I: Won't you be seated? (Points to chair next to her desk.)
Seating themselves in chair.	S: Thank you.
	I: Sorry to keep you waiting. The appointment before yours took longer than I had anticipated. I hope you won't be too inconvenienced.

S: Well, I--er--was beginning to think you might have forgotten about me. Or then I thought I'd gotten the time mixed up.

I: I <u>am</u> sorry. Please forgive me.

S: Oh, that's O.K., I understand.

I: Well, now let's get down to business, shall we?

Shift in chair nervous gesture.

S: (Pause, then nod of head indicating yes.)

I: I understand that you're interested in applying for a job with our company.

S: Yes, that's right. The Medical library position.

I: May I see your application, please?

<u>S</u> hands over application according to disability.

<u>I</u> appears to look over application.

I: Um. (Nods head.)

S: (Looks on, displaying nervousness.)

I: Well, I see here by your application you are 23 years old, single, and born in Cleveland, Ohio.

S: Yes, that's right. My folks moved <u>here</u> about a year ago, so this is home.

I: How long have you been residing at this present address, Mr./Miss Haely?

S: Since February of this year. I live with a girl/boyfriend. We share an apartment together.

I: Oh, I see. Do you like apartment living?

S: It's O.K. We're close to the stores and the bus line, so it's convenient. But if I don't get a job soon I might have to give it up.

S expresses nervousness.

I: How long have you been looking?

S: You see, I've been looking for a job that I think I'd like for about the last month; but there isn't much available in my line.

I: Where did you work before?

S: I worked in the purchasing department at Town Supplies.

I: Just what did you do there?

S: Well, I kept track of supplies, and if it was running low it was my responsibility to reorder for our suppliers. I have a lot of bookkeeping so to speak, and filing with that job.

I: What reason did you have for leaving?

S expresses nervousness and shifts in chair.

S: Well, I quit that job because it wasn't really what I wanted. There was little room for advancement, plus the pay was very poor. That was the first job I've had since getting out of school, and it's really not what I wanted.

I looks at application.

I: I see here by your application you received an associate degree from State.

S: Yes, that's correct. You can see that I have no experience in this line of work, but I do know something about medical librarian work from the courses I took at State.

I: Yes, and I also see you did very well at school. Your grades are better than average.

S: Thank you. I can say that I worked hard in school and I guess it paid off, at least gradewise. This is really the type of job I want to get into, and I think I'd enjoy it and be good at it. (Pause) Plus I think I have the background needed for it.

I: It looks like you have all the necessary requirements from school for this position. However, we had hoped we could find someone with experience.

Nervous reply.

S: Oh, I see. I'm afraid I don't have that ...

I: You appear to be a little on the nervous side.

S: Yes, I guess I'm a little nervous. You'd think I'd be used to job interviewers by now. I've had about six interviews within two weeks, but no luck.

I: I understand. Looking for a job isn't the most pleasant thing, but try and relax.

S: I'll try, but I won't promise.

I: Tell me, how did you hear about our job opening?

S: The lady at the employment agency told me about it. She said it sounded right up my alley.

Also, I had a friend who worked here until they (he/she) moved away. He/She said it was a good company to work for, plus it has good benefits.

I: That's right. Blue Cross, and an excellent retirement program.

S: Oh, that's good.

I: This company also has a pretty good program for advancement. How do you feel about advancement?

S: Well, I'm eager to learn and improve. If the opportunity comes for advancement I don't think I would have a difficult decision, plus I don't think I would turn down a promotion.

I: Well, that's good to hear. I don't know if I told you we have two weeks' paid vacations for our employees.

S: No, you didn't. If I was hired would I get vacation time for this year?

I: I think you would. (Pause) Tell me, Mr./Miss Haely, how do you get along with people?

S: I get along with most people reasonably well. I think I make friends easily, and I'm not nervous around people.

I: Do you have any hobbies?

S: Oh, yes. I like camping, music, and reading. I also enjoy swimming. I feel it is good exercise and very relaxing.

I: How about sports?

S: I enjoy watching basketball, football, and I like to play tennis, but I must confess I'm not very good at it. I do enjoy watching sports, however.

I: If you are hired for this position, you will have to have a medical examination.

S: Oh, I see.

I: Do you have or have you ever had any disability?

S: No, just the usual childhood diseases, like mumps, measles, chicken pox.

I: Have you ever been hospitalized?

S: Only when I had my tonsils out when I was a little kid.

I: Do you feel that you will be able to adjust to this job?

S: Oh, I don't foresee any problems, as long as I could get some help learning the job.

I: Someone would be with you for a few weeks and help you learn the job and procedures.

Do you drive?

S: No, but I don't think transportation would be a problem. I took the bus today and it only took me 15 minutes to get here.

I: Do you have any questions you want to ask?

S: Yes, er ... how much does the job pay?

I: The starting salary will depend upon the qualifications and experience. There are several other people also applying for this same position. If you are considered, salary will be further discussed at another interview.

S: Could you at least give me an idea?

I: I think this position's starting salary with no experience is around $7,000 per year.

S: Oh, I see .... (Pause) What are the hours?

I: The hours are 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., five days a week. With an hour off for lunch, and two coffee breaks a day.

S: Does this include paid holidays and sick leave?

I: Yes, it does.

S: When would I know if I was being considered for this job?

I: Within a week.

S: Could I call you next week?

I: That would be fine.

I will get in touch with your references and have some news for you by next Wednesday.

S: All right. (Pause)

I: Well, if there are no further questions ...

S: No, I can't think of any right now.

Getting up from chair, shaking hands.

(Pause) Well, thank you for seeing me, and I will call you next week.

I: Goodbye, Mr./Miss Haely.

S: Goodbye, and again thank you.

Reference

Aronson, E. Some antecedents of interpersonal attraction. In W. J. Arnold and D. Levine (Eds.), Nebraska symposium on motivation. Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.

Barker, D. G. Concepts of disability. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 43 (4), 371-374.

Barker, R. G. The social psychology of physical disability. Journal of Social Issues, 1948, 6, 28-35.

Bentz, W. K., Hollister, W. G., & Kherlopian, M. Attitudes of social distance and social responsibility for mental illness: A comparison of teachers and the general public. Psychological [illegible] Schools, 1970, (2), 198-203.

Bost, G. A. The minority status of the physically disabled. Cerebral Palsy Journal, 1967, 28, 3-4, 8.

Bogardus, E. G. Social distance scale. Social and Sociology Research, 1933, 17, 265-271.

Bryne, D. Attitudes and attraction. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press, 1961.

Chesler, M. A. Ethnocentrism and attitudes toward the physically disabled. Journal of Personality and Psychology, 1965, Vol. 2, No. 6, 877-882.

Cohen, J., & Struening, E. L. Opinions about mental illness in the personnel of two mental hospitals. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 349-360.

Cohen, J., & Struening, E. L. Opinions about mental illness: mental hospital occupational profiles and profile clusters. Psychological Reports, 1963, 12, 111-124.

Cohen, J., & Struening, E. L. Opinions about mental illness: hospital social atmosphere profiles and their relevance to effectiveness. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1964, 28, 291-298.

Cruickshank, W. M. The impact of physical disability on social adjustment. Journal of Social Issues, 1948, 4, 78-83.

Deutsch, M., & Krauss, R. M. Theories in social psychology. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

DuBrow, A. L. Attitudes toward disability. Journal of Rehabilitation, 31, (4), 25-26.

Feinberg, E. A. Evaluation of adjustment, social desirability and attitudes toward disabled. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 46, 375-381.

Festinger, L., Schachter, S., & Back, K. Social pressures in informal groups: A study of human factors in housing. New York: Harper, 1950.

Genskow, J. K., & Maglione, F. E. Familiarity dogmatism and reported student attitudes toward the disabled. Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 62, 329-341.

Goffman, E. Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Goodman, N., Dornbusch, S. M., Richardson, S. A., & Hastoff, A. H. Variant reactions to physical disabilities. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 429-435.

Granofsky, J. Modification of attitude toward the physically disabled. Dissertation Abstracts, 1956, 16, 1182-1183.

Handle, A. F. Measuring social distance in relations with the blind. Outlook for the Blind, 1960, 54, 361-366.

Homans, G. C. Social behavior: Its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961.

Iverson, M. A. Personality impressions of punitive stimulus persons of differential status. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 617-626.

Jensema, Carl J., & Shears, L. M. Acceptance of anomalous conditions studied through assessment of stereotype dimensions. Rehab. Counseling Bulletin, 1972, (June), Vol. 15, 242-251.

Johannsen, W. J. Attitudes toward mental patients. Mental Hygiene, 1969, 53, (2), 218-228.

Kirchner, W. K. The attitudes of special groups toward the employment of older persons. Journal Gerontological, 1957, 12, 216-220.

Kleck, R. Physical stigma and nonverbal cues emitted in face to face interaction. Human Relations, 1968, 21, 19-28.

Kutner, B. The social psychology of disability. In W. S. Neff (Ed.), Rehabilitation Psychology. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Assoc., Inc., 1971.

Lemkau, P. V., & Crocetti, G. M. An urban population's opinion and knowledge about mental illness. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1962, 118, 692-700.

Lieberman, L. R. Attitudes toward the mentally ill, knowledge of mental illness and personal adjustment. Psychological Reports, 1970, (Feb.), Vol. 26, 47-52.

MacDonald, A. P., & Hall, J. Perception of disability by the nondisabled. Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 654-660.

Meyerson, L. Physical disability as a social psychological problem. Journal of Social Issues, 1948, 4, 2-10.

Muhlenkamp, A. F. Attitudes of nursing students toward 8 major disabilities. Psychological Reports, 1971, (Dec.), Vol. 29, 973-974.

Neff, W. S., & Weiss, S. A. The psychological aspects of disability. In B. A. Wolman (Ed.), Handbook of clinical psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Nunnally, J. C. Popular conceptions of mental health. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

Olshansky, S., Grab, S., & Malamud, I. T. Employers' Attitudes and practices in the living of ex-mental patients. Mental Hygiene, 1958, 42, 391-401.

Palmerton, K. E., & Frumkin, R. M. Type of contact as a factor in attitudes of college counselors toward physically disabled. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1969, 28, 489-490.

Palmerton, K. E., & Frumkin, R. M. College counselor knowledge about attitudes toward disabled persons. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1969, 28, 657-658.

Phillips, D. L. Rejection: A possible consequence of seeking help for mental disorders. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 963-972.

Phillips, D. L. Rejection of the mentally ill: The influence of behavior and sex. American Sociological Review, 1964, 29, 679-687.

Rabkin, L. F., & Suchoski, J. F. Teachers' views of mental illness: A study of attitudes and information. Journal of Teacher Education, 1967, 18, 36-41.

Sarbin, T. R., & Mancuso, J. Failure of moral enterprise: Attitudes of the public toward mental illness. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1970, (Oct.), 35, (2), 159-173.

Secord, P. F., & Backman, C. W. Social psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Shapiro, D. Psychological factors in friendship, choice & rejection. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1953.

Siller, J., Chipman, A., Ferguson, L., & Vann, D. Studies in reactions to disability. XI: Attitudes of the nondisabled toward the physically disabled. New York: New York University, 1967.

Star, S. A. The public's ideas about mental illness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Mental Health, Indianapolis, 1955.

Sussman, M. B. Sociological theory and deafness: Problems and prospects. American Speech & Hearing Association Journal, 1966, 8, 303-307.

Sussman, M. B. Dependent, disabled, and dependent poor: Similarity of conceptual issues and research needs. Social Service Review, 1969, 43, 383-395.

Tseng, M. S. Attitudes toward the disabled: A cross-cultural study. Journal of Social Psychology, 1972, (Aug.), 87, 311-312.

Wicas, E. A., & Carluccio, L. W. Attitudes of counselors toward three handicapped client groups. Rehab. Counseling Bulletin, 1971, (Sept.), 25-34.

Wilson, M. E., Salotto, R., & Franklin, R. M. Attitudes of some gifted adults, future rehabilitation counselors, and rehabilitation professors toward disabilities. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22, 1303-1304.

Winch, R. F. Mate-selection: A study of complementary needs. New York: Harper & Row, 1958.

Wright, B. A. Physical disability a psychology approach. New York: Harper, 1960.

Yamamoto, K., & Dizney, H. F. Rejection of the mentally ill: A study of attitudes of student teachers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 264-268.

Yuker, H. E. A scale to measure attitudes toward disabled persons. In Human Resources Study No. 5. Albertson, New York: Human Resources Foundation, 1960.

Yuker, H. E. Attitudes as determents of behavior. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1965, 31, 15-16.